



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/528,978	03/21/2000	R. Scott Obach	PC10244A	7527
23913	7590	10/21/2003	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC 150 EAST 42ND STREET 5TH FLOOR - STOP 49 NEW YORK, NY 10017-5612			JIANG, SHAOJIA A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1617	18	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/528,978	OBACH, R. SCOTT
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shaojia A Jiang	1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2003.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 1,11 and 23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,11 and 23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Disposition of Claims**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 17.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This Office Action is a response to Applicant's amendment and response filed on August 4, 2003 in Paper No. 16 wherein claims 2-10 and 12-22 are cancelled, and claim 1 has been amended and claim 23 is newly submitted.

Currently, claims 1, 11, and 23 are pending in this application.

Again, as indicated in the previous Office Action July 24, 2003, Applicant's election with traverse of the elected species of (2S,3S)-2-phenyl-3-(2-methoxy-5-trifluoromethoxyphenyl)methylamino-piperidine in claim 6 and quindine in claim 11 in Paper No. 4, submitted July 26, 2001. See the Office Action (mailed August 14, 2001).

Claims 1, 11, and 23 are examined on the merits herein.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for scope of enablement because the specification, while being enabling for the particular CYP2D6 substrate or drug for CYP2D6 mediated oxidative biotransformation, (2S,3S)-2-phenyl-3-(2-methoxy-5-trifluoromethoxyphenyl)methylamino-piperidine, disclosed in claim 1 and the specification (see page 4), and co-administering the particular CYP2D6 inhibitor, quindine or ajmalacine disclosed in claims 11 and 23 and the specification

(see page 4) in claimed method herein, does not reasonably provide enablement for the employment any CYP2D6 substrates in combination with any CYP2D6 inhibitors in the claimed methods of the particular treatments herein, for the same reasons of record stated in the Office Action dated July 24, 2003.

Applicant's amendment filed on August 4, 2003 in Paper No. 16 with respect to this rejection in the previous Office Action have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive since even though claim 1 recites the particular drug for CYP2D6 mediated oxidative biotransformation, (2S,3S)-2-phenyl-3-(2-methoxy-5-trifluoromethoxyphenyl)methylamino-piperidine, and claim 23 recites the particular CYP2D6 inhibitor, quindine or ajmalacine, claims 1 or 23 still reads on any *combinations* of (2S,3S)-2-phenyl-3-(2-methoxy-5-trifluoromethoxyphenyl)methylamino-piperidine and any compound represented by CYP2D6 inhibitors which are not the same compound; or any *combinations* of any compounds represented by CYP2D6 substrates and quindine or ajmalacine. As discussed in the previous Office Action, in view of the Wands factors, the case *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.* (CAFC, 1997) and *In re Fisher* (CCPA 1970) discussed above, to practice the claimed invention herein, a person of skill in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to test all compounds encompassed in the instant claims and their combinations to be administered to a host employed in the claimed methods of the particular treatments herein, with no assurance of success.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 11, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benet et al. (5,567,592) and Hess (WO 96/14845) for the same reasons of record stated in the previous Office Actions dated July 24, 2003.

Applicant's remarks filed on March 18, 2002 in Paper No. 7 with respect to this rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, and 11 made under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of record stated in the previous Office Action (August 14, 2001) have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive as to the nonobviousness of the claimed invention over the prior art for the following reasons.

Applicant's assertions that the there is no motivation or suggestion whatsoever in the prior art to use the claimed combinations and that *In re Kerkhoven* is not applicable to this case since two components, (2S,3S)-2-phenyl-3-(2-methoxy-5-trifluoromethoxyphenyl)methylamino-piperidine and quinidine do not have the same purpose, have been considered but not found persuasive. As discussed in the previous Office Action, both NK-1 receptor antagonists including the elected species, (2S,3S)-2-phenyl-3-(2-methoxy-5-trifluoromethoxyphenyl)methylamino-piperidine, and quinidine are well known CYP2D6 substrates, as taught by Applicant's admission regarding the prior art in the instant specification (see page 4 lines 5-8 and 14-26). Moreover, as

discussed in the previous Office Action, it is well known that CYP2D6 substrates mediate oxidative biotransformation for the major clearance mechanism in humans. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably expected that combining two particular CYP2D6 substrates (two instant elected species) known useful for the same purpose, i.e., mediating oxidative biotransformation for the major clearance mechanism in humans, in a composition to be administered would produce additive therapeutic effects to improve the same treatment, absent evidence to the contrary. Thus, *In re Kerkhoven* is seen to be applicable to the instant case. It has been held that it is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for same purpose in order to form a third composition that is to be used for the very same purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art. *In re Kerkhoven*, 205 USPQ 1069, CCPA 1980. See MPEP 2144.06. In the instant case,

Additionally, Applicant arguments that the examiner has made parallels with other enzyme, CYP3A, with CYP2D6, according to Benet's teaching regarding the combination of two CYP3A, have been considered but not found persuasive. Benet's teaching regarding the combination of two CYP3A have been cited by the examiner primarily for this teaching further provides motivation to employ the combination herein.

Therefore, motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art cited herein to make the present invention is seen. The claimed invention is clearly obvious in view of the prior art.

The record contains no clear and convincing evidence of nonobviousness or unexpected results for the combination herein over the prior art. In this regard, it is noted that the specification provides no side-by-side comparison with the closest prior art in support of nonobviousness for the instant claimed invention over the prior art.

For the above stated reasons, said claims are properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Therefore, said rejection is adhered to.

In view of the rejections to the pending claims set forth above, no claims are allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Jiang, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-1235.

S. Anna Jiang, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner, AU 1617  
October 9, 2003

  
SREENI PADMANABHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
10/20/03